DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 113 TE 001 532

By-Godshalk, Fred I.

A Survey of the Teaching of English in Secondary Schools.

Educational Testing Service, Berkeley, Calif.
Report No-TDR-69-8
Pub Date May 69
Note-37p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.95
Descriptors-Authors, Books, Class Activities, *Composition (Literary), English Curriculum, *English Instruction, Grade 11, Grade 12, Grading, *Language, Linguistics, *Literature, Literature Appreciation, Reading Materials, *Secondary Education, Teaching Methods, Writing

To indicate what high school students have actually studied during the previous 10 years of changing secondary school curricula, this document reports the findings of a questionnaire survey conducted among 2,247 students who took the 1965-66 College Entrance Examination Board's English Composition Test. The report is divided into three parts--composition, language, and literature--and the data is organized so that the relative emphasis upon various instructional activities, as reported by the students, will be apparent. Some of the topics covered are the frequency of composition assignments, grading, linguistic subjects studied, literature read, and skills practiced. The facts presented are interpreted to help teachers improve their instruction. (JM)

EDO 33113

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TEST DEVELOPMENT REPORT
TDR-69-8 MAY 1969

A Survey of the Teaching of English in Secondary Schools

Fred I. Godshalk
Test Development Division, ETS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Educational Testing Service
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

COPYRIGHT © 1969
BY
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
PRINCETON, N. J. • BERKELEY, CALIF.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface i

Acknowledgments ii

Introduction 1

Composition 3

Composition Activities: What, How, Why 3

High Frequency Activities 4

Twelfth-Grade Differences 5

Comparative Emphasis, All Activities 6

Summary of Twelfth-Grade Differences 8

How Much Writing and How Is It Marked? 8

Grades, and Markings or Corrections 10

Language 12

Language Study and "Linguistics" 12

Systematic Study of Linguistics 14

Literature 16

The Plan of the Survey 16

Activities and Their Emphasis 17

A Lookers' Guide 20

On Playing the Name-Game 21

Would You Believe . . . ? 22

The Great Authors List 23

The Highest Tenth 24

Studied by 50% to 60% 25

The Not-Too-Well-Knowns 26

What Ever Happened to . . . ? 27

Appendix 29

A SURVEY OF THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Preface

Probably more changes have occurred in secondary school curricula during the past ten years than in any previous decade in our nation's history. The impact of these changes on the academic preparation of college-bound students is of concern to the College Entrance Examination Board, which prepares achievement tests for college admissions programs. To obtain factual information on what individuals actually study in secondary school, the College Entrance Examination Board supported a survey of about 38,000 students who took College Board achievement tests during the 1965-1966 academic year. These students represented more than 7,500 secondary schools throughout the United States.

Before the survey was initiated, the question of whether or not students both could and would give valid accounts of their educational experiences was investigated. The results of this feasibility study, which was conducted in about 50 secondary schools for seniors studying French and chemistry, showed a satisfactorily high agreement between teachers' and students' responses to the same questions. As might be expected, agreement was highest in the most recent grades. However, even as far back as grade 9, there was a mean student-teacher agreement of 70 per cent. In the case of highly factual questions, percentages ranged from 90 to 100 per cent. Interviews carried on in a selected sample of these 50 schools showed that students' responses to questions that they fully understood were valid even in the case of recall over three and four years.

At the outset, these data were to be used only for developing better achievement tests. However, as the study progressed, their potential usefulness to a wider audience of educators became more apparent. The fact that College Board achievement tests are taken by only a fraction of college entrants is an inherent limitation in the use of these data. However, extensive information such as that collected for this study is highly relevant to many current issues in secondary education.

Consequently, Educational Testing Service is publishing these results in a series of eight reports, one in each of the following subjects: English, history, biology, chemistry, physics, mathematics, Latin, and modern foreign languages (French, German, and Spanish). The author of each of these reports is an examiner in the subject field in the Test Development Division of Educational Testing Service. Special consultants assisted these authors in identifying the findings in each field that would be of the greatest importance and interest to the educational community. Details of the study design and administration appear in the appendix.

Elizabeth W. Haven
Project Director

Acknowledgments

Greatest credit and most sincere thanks are due the 2247 students who spent their own time to produce the information recorded here. They were eleventh grade and twelfth grade students from public, Roman Catholic, and independent secondary schools throughout the country. The group was made up of 1297 seniors who took the English Composition Test in December or January, 337 seniors who took it in March, and 613 juniors who took it in May. Responding to the questionnaire of 299 questions was a considerable chore, and the students' willingness to be of help is most commendable.

The extensive questionnaire was produced by members of the English Composition Test Committee and by Educational Testing Service professional staff members Gertrude C. Conlan and Miriam K. Levin. Miss Conlan was responsible for puzzling over, coordinating, and editing the committee's work. Mrs. Levin prepared the questions for the Language portion of the survey. Philip Burnham, chairman of the ECT Committee when the project was concluded, deserves special mention and our thanks for service as a consultant in the preparation of the report.

The members of the ECT Committee during all or part of the time for consideration and development of the project were as follows:

Philip Burnham, St. Paul's School
Francis Christensen, University of Southern California
Clarence W. Hach, Evanston Township High School
Bruce MacDonald, Rincon High School
Annette McCormick, Louisiana State University
John H. Middendorf, Columbia University
Marjorie Muirden, Portland State College
Franklin G. Myers, Scarsdale High School
Osmond Palmer, Michigan State University
William H. Wiatt, Indiana University

Of great influence upon and assistance to me in the preparation of the report were ETS staff members Elizabeth W. Haven, David E. Loye, Richard L. Burns, and Dorothea S. Fisher. I am most grateful to them all.

Introduction

This is a report of high school students' responses to a questionnaire concerning the English curriculum. The students were selected from those who had taken the English Composition Test of the College Entrance Examination Board. Questions were prepared by the Board's Committee of Examiners for the English Composition Test, with Educational Testing Service assistance.

The report is divided into three parts that deal with composition, language, and literature. In doing so, it follows the tripartite organization of the secondary school English curriculum recommended by the Commission on English. There is an attempt in each part of the report to organize the data so that the relative emphasis upon various instructional activities, as reported by the students, will be apparent.

Beyond this, students' answers to the questions beget a natural speculation, further mental questioning directed towards the interpretation and implications of the data. The text includes a few possible answers to such hypothetical questions. Very likely these speculative responses are not the right ones. In any case, all identifiable interpretations, explicit and implied, should be understood to be the author's only. They do not reflect any official policies of the organizations that sponsored the survey, or any judgments made by the individuals who gave the survey its form and substance.

It seems probable that the most interested audience for such a report is made up of English teachers. Hence, most of the report's focus is upon the teacher and his conception of his profession; that is, the facts and comments should help the teacher to think about his job, if that is what he calls it. In a manner of speaking, one sets out to talk with teachers: to ask what they are doing and, occasionally, to wonder why they are doing it. A report without some interpretation of this kind would be, I think, a dull product from the impersonal world of data and their mechanical organization—a counting, by categories. No teacher-reader would, or should, get farther than page three.

It is our experience that only a relatively few English teachers are really familiar with the College Board achievement tests in English. Therefore, a caveat legens is addressed to most teachers who may read this report. If they ask: "Will this report help us prepare our students for 'the Boards'?" the answer is no more than "maybe" if they read the report for ideas about a subject that is changing somewhat with the times. The answer must be an unqualified "no" if

they are looking for any direct connection between this report and CEEB tests in English. The hints for harassed mentors are buried deep.

For many years the achievement test in English, CEEB, has been the English Composition Test, which is designed to measure indirectly, and sometimes in part directly by means of a centrally scored short essay, the skill of the student in handling the written language. In May of 1968 a second test was introduced, the achievement test in literature, and this will be offered in some of the regular administrations hereafter. This test is also designed to assess a skill, the complex performance that results in the analysis and interpretation of literary materials. The test has almost nothing to do with literary history; once in a great while a question has to do with putting a passage into its period or "school" on the basis of textual clues.

In both tests, then, the focus is upon performance: what the student can do because of what he knows, regardless of the source or nature of his instruction. This warning to the reader, therefore, is intended to preclude his search in this report for devices or procedures that may assist him in preparing students for College Board English testing.

The best source of information about the tests, we should add, is the pamphlet entitled A Description of the College Board Achievement Tests. Any teacher whose students apply for the test should be able to find copies of the booklet in his school. If not, they are available upon request made to the CEEB, Box 592, Princeton, New Jersey 08540, or Box 1025, Berkeley, California 94701.

Composition

Composition Activities: What, How, Why

Can writing be taught? Probably not. What, then, is the excuse for the expenditure upon composition of one-fourth to one-half (in rare cases, perhaps two-thirds) of all the time reasonably available to most students for the study of English?

Well, learning to write is a matter of practice under direction, with assistance and criticism—a matter, first of all, of trial and error. So that's what we try to do. . . . Or, well, so many students have bad habits of grammar and usage that we spend most composition time on grammar exercises from texts and workbooks. . . . Or, in our case, the writing is so slovenly, so uninterestedly awful, that about all we can do is red-pencil everything and require corrections.

What consideration is given to the student's reason for writing, his involvement in the learning process? Is he, as they say, properly motivated? Or does he write in a vacuum—that is, to please the teacher, and to pass the course? Who is his audience? What does he have to say to it? . . . Or what if he lacks the creative imagination?—Do we then require of him a poem, a short story, or a one-act play? . . . Or what if he believes that nothing he does could possibly interest the teacher?—Do we expect of him a rousing tale of the daily routine at Boy Scout Camp? Or of the night he was locked out of his house and broke a window to get in? . . . Or what if he plods along in the reading of juvenilia three to five years "below his grade level," childish stuff, amateurishly written?—Do we ask of him that he write critical analysis and interpretation of Captain Ahab or of Hamlet, of Gulliver or Silas?

We can't find all the answers here, of course, because we don't know all the questions, or how to ask them. But certain activities of these students are implied answers to the questions of what is done, and how, and perhaps even why, in the interest of developing the composition skill.

The students were asked to estimate the frequency of some typical composition activities, responding for each activity that it occurred frequently, occasionally, rarely, or never. Frequently was defined for the student as at least once a week, on the average. Rarely was said to be a maximum of three or four times a year. Occasionally, coming between "frequently" and "rarely," was not defined at all; in theory, it will therefore average out to ten or twelve times a year. And so, as we interpret students' estimates, we go downward from thirty to thirty-six times a year (frequently—at least once a week), to perhaps ten or twelve times a year (occasionally), to three or four times a year (rarely), and, of course, to never ("nothing of the sort was done at any time").

High-Frequency Activities

Twelve of the composition activities were reported as frequent or occasional by more than fifty per cent of eleventh grade students in each case. (See Table 1.) The rank order is based upon the percentage of students who said that the specified activity occurred frequently. The eleventh grade data are used because they are based upon an entire year of work. Differences in reports of these activities by twelfth graders will be noted when they seem significant.

TABLE 1

Per Cent of Students Who Said Activity Occurred in Grade Eleven

IOE*	F	O	R	N	Activity or Exercise
98	69	20	8	3	Proofread paper before submitting it
71	39	45	14	2	Wrote outside class on subject assigned by teacher
62	34	38	17	10	Did grammar exercise from a text or a workbook
54	27	38	23	12	Wrote a paper on literary work studied concurrently
51	23	41	25	11	Studied theory: methods of writing by types
48	22	35	30	13	Made a topic outline before starting to write
47	21	38	29	12	Wrote an essay
47	19	44	28	9	Wrote a class paper without prior notice (impromptu)
45	17	44	28	12	Wrote a class paper on a topic assigned earlier
44	17	41	30	12	Wrote a paper having as title one given by the teacher
38	13	40	28	18	Worked on an "interlinear" exercise (correct or revise)
38	12	40	38	10	Wrote a paper based upon personal experience

*Index of Emphasis (see text). Other column headings stand for Frequently, Occasionally, Rarely, and Never.

A procedure is needed that will reduce four kinds of percentages to a single scale for easy comparisons. (It is obviously impossible to add varying numbers of the lemons, oranges, and grapefruit in each one of several containers if one is to create comparable measures of the price or value of mixed fruit.) Such an aid to interpretation is what we have called the IOE, or Index of Emphasis. It is derived by multiplying the "frequently" figure for any activity by 9, the "occasionally" figure by 3, adding these products to the "rarely" figure, and dividing by 7. This procedure reflects our interpretation of students' estimates: "occasionally" is about three times as often as "rarely," and "frequently" is about three times as often as "occasionally" or, therefore, nine times as often as "rarely." The division by seven is mere compression, reducing totals proportionately for greater ease of comparison. Consequently, the first and fifth activities

reported in Table 1 have IOE's of 98 and 51, respectively, rather than of 689 and 355.

It is now possible to compare the emphasis placed upon an activity with that accorded to any other. For example, one can say that English teachers in eleventh grade classrooms throughout the country (or almost everywhere when one grants that not all such teachers have students who "take the Boards") have managed to persuade their disciples that "proofreading" a paper before submitting it (IOE=98) is about twice as important as making a topic outline before starting to write (IOE=48). Or one can say that in these classrooms, writing a paper based upon personal experience is about two-thirds as important as writing a paper on a literary work studied concurrently, since the two activities have IOE's of 38 and 54, respectively.

For only those English teachers whose math fingers are all thumbs, 38/54ths is 70% (divide 38 by 54), and 70% is three per cent more than two-thirds (67%). So the relative emphasis upon a teacher's requiring writing about a personal experience and requiring writing about a literary work is shown by the fact that the former is done approximately twice to the latter's three times. More exactly, the former is done seven times, and the latter ten times. However, in this setting of students' estimates, the difference between two-thirds, which is six-ninths, and seven-tenths is obviously not very great.

Twelfth-Grade Differences

The twelfth graders' judgment of the frequency of these top-twelve activities does not differ a great deal from the eleventh graders' judgments shown in the table. In fact, because a drop in frequently is usually compensated for by an increase in occasionally, most differences in the Index of Emphasis between the grades are too slight to be considered There are some differences in the frequently category that may be of interest, however.

For nine of the twelve activities, this difference is no greater than four percentage points. Beyond this, the seniors report that proofreading a paper, top of the list, is frequent on the part of 64%--five per cent fewer than the juniors reported. Also, for fourth-ranked "writing a paper based upon a literary work," the juniors report frequently at the 27% level, the seniors at 22%. In only two cases do seniors report frequently at a higher level than do juniors: 15% to 13% for working on an interlinear, and 13% to 12% for the personal experience paper. These two are at the bottom of the list of twelve activities. The greatest difference is the eight percentage points for second-ranked "wrote outside class on subject assigned by teacher": juniors, 39%; seniors, 31%.

On the average, the seniors seem to be reporting less emphasis on writing in the twelfth grade than juniors find in the eleventh. One may speculate that relatively more time is given in the final year to other activities, particularly to literature. Or the difference may be nothing more than a greater tendency to conservatism in judgments as one grows older. Not much older, to be sure, but possibly enough to say to oneself: "We didn't write all that frequently. I'll call it occasionally."

Comparative Emphasis, All Activities

The information presented so far has had to do with "high-frequency" activities, those reported as frequent or occasional by more than half the students. These twelve activities, as Table 1 shows, range downward in classroom emphasis from an IOE of 98 to one of 38. The questionnaire included fifteen other activities that students reported as less frequent. On the frequently plus occasionally basis, students' responses produced a high of 46% for "corrected only the errors of mechanics" after a paper had been returned and a low of 8% for "revised a paper written by another student." Corresponding IOE's for these activities are 36 and 7.

The data for all 27 questions are presented in Table 2. The activities have been sorted into five categories in an attempt to make comparisons more useful. The activities are, in general, of the following types:

I. Conditions of the writing activity
II. General nature of the writing stimulus
III. The writing genre, or types
IV. Collateral activities, presumably useful
V. Dealing with the trial-error results

Activities in each category are listed in the rank order of IOE's. This does not, however, prevent the reader's comparison of items in more than one category. Any pair of activities can be compared on the basis of reported IOE's, and in greater detail by inspection of the figures for frequently, occasionally, etc. Further assistance to interpretation may be found in the Rank order column, just preceding the definitions of activities.

TABLE 2

Summary of Composition Activities in Grade Eleven

	Index of Emphasis ("IOE")	F	O	R	N	Rank Order	What Students Did
I.	*a 71	39	45	14	2	2.	Wrote a paper outside of class on a subject or topic assigned by the teacher
	b 47	19	44	28	9	8.	Wrote a paper in class without prior notice (impromptu)
	c 45	17	44	28	12	9.	Wrote a paper in class on a subject or topic that was assigned earlier
II.	d 44	17	41	30	12	10.	Wrote a paper having as a title one given by the teacher
	e 33	11	33	36	19	14.	Wrote a paper on a problem given by the teacher in the form of a question
	f 32	11	31	35	22	16.	Wrote a paper around a topic sentence given by the teacher
	g 28	8	28	37	27	18.	Wrote a paper on a quotation provided by the teacher
III.	h 54	27	38	23	12	4.	Wrote a paper on a literary work being studied concurrently
	i 47	21	38	29	12	7.	Wrote an essay
	j 38	12	40	38	10	12.	Wrote a composition based on your own experience
	k 29	14	16	29	41	17.	Wrote a letter
	l 27	7	24	51	17	20.	Wrote a "library" or "research" paper
	m 18	5	14	40	41	23.	Wrote a poem
	n 12	2	11	34	52	25.	Wrote a short story or play
IV.	o 98	69	20	8	3	1.	Proofread your own paper before turning it in
	p 62	34	38	17	10	3.	Did a grammar exercise from a text or workbook
	q 51	23	41	25	11	5.	Learned about special methods used in different types of writing, such as narrative, descriptive, expository, and argumentative writing
	r 48	22	35	30	13	6.	Made a topic outline before beginning to write
	s 38	13	40	28	18	11.	Worked on "interlinear" passages (correcting and rewriting poorly written paragraphs)
	t 27	10	22	36	32	19.	Made a sentence outline before beginning to write
	u 11	2	11	28	59	26.	Wrote by imitating an author, following his pattern and style but writing on a different subject
	v 7	1	7	18	75	27.	Revised a paper written by another student
V.	w 36	15	31	27	46	13.	Corrected only the errors in mechanics (spelling, punctuation, grammar) in a paper after it had been returned by the teacher
	x 32	12	29	29	30	15.	Corrected errors in mechanics and rewrote parts of a paper after it had been returned by the teacher
	y 26	8	26	31	36	21.	Proofread a paper written by another student
	z 22	6	23	32	39	22.	Had conference with teacher to discuss your writing
	A 17	4	16	32	47	24.	Rewrote an entire paper after it had been returned by the teacher

*Reference, for discussion.

Summary of Twelfth-Grade Differences

Of the 27 activities listed in Table 2, 21 show changes in emphasis of three IOE-points or less. Most twelfth-grade differences are downward; that is, they show less emphasis in the twelfth grade. Down three points on the scale are five activities: b, g, m, o, and z. Five more are down two points; six are down only one; three show no differences. Two go up in twelfth grade by one point.

The remaining six activities show changes in the twelfth grade that range from four to eight points on the scale. Of these, four differences go downward, following the trend: by eight points, a; by seven points, h; by five points each, c and r. The two differences that go upward are for activities A, an increase of four points, and x, an increase of five. These activities are, respectively, rewriting an entire marked paper, and rewriting parts of a paper together with correcting errors in mechanics.

There seem to be major differences of emphasis upon these six activities in the two grades, but the interpretation of the differences is very "iffy." Three of the activities that are less emphasized in grade twelve have to do with the amount of writing required: outside of class, a, down from 71 to 63 index points, or about 12%; on a literary work, h, down seven points, or 13%; in class on a topic assigned earlier, c, down five points, or 11%. Opposite this information we must place the increases already referred to: for rewriting an entire paper, A, up four points, or 23.5%, and for extensive revision and correction of a returned paper, x, up five points, or 15.6%.

We may guess, perhaps we may hope if our experience and bias go that way, that less writing is required in the twelfth grade but that more is done, or attempted, to make writing a developmental exercise. We would still have doubts, of course, about such emphasis as that shown in the responses to item p; that is, IOE's of 62 and 61 points, respectively, in the junior and senior years. This means that roughly twice as much emphasis is placed upon so-called "grammar" exercises as is given to the revision and correction of the student's own writing (x, with IOE's of 32 and 37). It means also that such grammar exercises are emphasized in the twelfth grade about three times as much as rewriting an entire paper (A), and in the eleventh grade about three and six-tenths times as much.

How Much Writing and How Is It Marked?

Four questions were asked about the length of compositions and the amount of writing required. Two additional questions asked students about the grading of their compositions, and the kinds of corrections, suggestions, and other assistance offered by the teacher.

The questions on length and frequency produced the following responses:

Approximate number of words in shorter compositions required	Per cent response in grade 11	12	Average number of shorter compositions required every month	Per cent response in grade 11	12
100 words or less	13	16	None	25	6
About 200 words	40	43	One to two	28	43
About 300 words	31	31	Three to five	36	40
About 400 words	8	6	Six to ten	8	8
500 words or more	7	5	More than ten	2	2

Approximate number of words in longer compositions required	Per cent response in grade 11	12	Average number of longer compositions required every month	Per cent response in grade 11	12
250 words or less	8	9	None	25	23
About 500 words	35	35	One to two	64	67
About 750 words	18	21	Three to five	10	10
About 1000 words	20	18	Six to ten	--	--
More than 1000 words	18	17	More than ten	--	--

There is a remarkable degree of similarity in eleventh and twelfth grade responses to the questions, with one exception. In the eleventh grade, say one-fourth of the students, no "shorter" compositions are required every month, and 28% say they must write one or two. Corresponding figures for the twelfth grade are six per cent for none and 43% for one or two.

All the data are hard to interpret, but these are especially so. Do they perhaps mean that no writing at all is done in the eleventh grade of one school out of four? Or are careful students responding that their total writing is less than one shorter composition every month—say one every two months, or about four in the school year? And if the 25% who say that no longer compositions are required every month in the eleventh grade should overlap considerably the 25% who say the same for shorter compositions, does this mean no writing at all for some students, or just astonishingly little writing?

About the only thing we can be sure of is that the writing of shorter compositions increases in the twelfth grade. Of course, we can also gather impressions: that at the lower end, upward of 25% of juniors do not write enough to do much good; that at the upper end it is conceivable, but admittedly unlikely, that a few students write nine to ten thousand words per month of twenty school days, or 450 to 500 words per school day. Since the professional writer, who does little else but write for a living, is a tremendous producer at a thousand salable words a day, half that from a student with no more than a one-fifth time commitment to the whole educational enterprise

called English is not likely to be work of great merit. Or of great potential for the development of writing ability.

Seriously, though, the great variation in length and frequency of writing requirements points up the question of what composition is all about. In its various manifestations, there is from all the evidence found in the survey a tremendous possible range from no writing and a great deal of "grammar" to a great deal of writing that presumably eventuates in little or no learning except for handwriting practice.

Grades, and Marking or Corrections

The two questions concerning teacher activity in reaction to student writing produced the following responses:

When your compositions were graded, did you receive a single, over-all grade or separate grades for content and mechanics?	Per cent response in grade 11	12
A. A single, over-all grade	52	55
B. One grade for content and another for mechanics	15	15
C. Sometimes a single grade and sometimes two grades, as in A and B above	28	29
D. A single over-all grade, and one grade for content and another for mechanics	5	2

How did your teacher correct your papers? Blacken as many boxes as apply.	Per cent response in grade 11	12
A. Gave only a grade	7	7
B. Marked errors in spelling and mechanics	24	28
C. Suggested ways to revise entire sentences	16	14
D. Commented on the way in which I approached the topic and wrote about it (my style)	19	17
E. Commented on what I had to say about the topic (my ideas)	19	19
F. Commented on the kinds of errors I had made on my paper	16	15

Dependent entirely upon the goodwill of the responder, questionnaires are severely limited in the extent of the task required. In addition to questions already omitted that teachers no doubt want answers for, a major question is implicit in the when of "When your compositions were graded," above.

There is no assumption that all compositions are graded—in fact, many practitioners of composition as a laboratory exercise say that many or most papers should not receive a grade. But it would be interesting for one to know how much the pressure for grades as rewards,

frequently the only motivation for the student, influences the teacher in his decision to mark and return papers, with a grade, or to do any of the tasks intermediate to throwing a lot of the effusions into File Thirteen.

Anyway, what follows upon the "When your papers were graded . . ." is worth more than casual attention. It will be noted that almost half of the teachers attempt to separate form and content, possibly to reward the effort of the poor writer to say something, however badly. On the other hand, the double grade may be a stick rather than a carrot; that is, a device to drive students to greater care in the mechanics of writing. This comes out at its extremes as A or B for content, F for, possibly, "careless spelling, and a comma splice in paragraph two. Learn to punctuate!"

Leading the list of corrective devices and other assistance is the marking of spelling and mechanics. This is a predictable outcome, to be sure, though possibly not a happy one. The four kinds of comments and suggestions that follow, C to F, are almost equally favored by the teachers who do more than give grades or mark mechanical errors.

Again, there is a great similarity of responses from grade eleven and grade twelve. The pattern is confirmed thereby; this must be what really happens. The unexpected result, though, comes to light when one sums each of the columns of numbers. Multiple responses were called for. (Blacken as many boxes as apply.) That is, only category A excludes further response, by saying "only a grade." But the eleventh grade responses total 101%; the twelfth grade, 100%. If these careful students responded properly, all the rest of the categories are also "only" in their experience. That is to say, their teachers always do just one of these things, no matter what kind of writing is required or done. Surely, pupils and circumstances differ enough to call for some individualization of the corrective or teaching devices that are the substance of trial-and-error learning.

Language

Language Study and "Linguistics"

In reporting the state of the art in the second of three divisions, Language, we are committed to reporting, no more. Considering the positions taken, pro and con and frequently acerb, a reporter is wise to say: "All we want to report is [are] the facts, ma'am—just the facts."

Questions on linguistics were included because the devisers of the study believed, or were persuaded, that answers would be interesting and useful. The idea was to find out what percentage of college bound students had been exposed (are exposed) to something that they can identify as "linguistics" if the term is defined for them. Thereafter, those who indicated that they had studied linguistics were asked which of 37 "linguistic terms" had been used in their study. The terms were selected in the hope that responses would give some indication (though surely no definitive information) of the attention given to various aspects or elements of linguistics at the secondary school level. It might also suggest the scope and depth of language study by revealing some differential emphasis.

The basic question was: "Since the beginning of grade 7, have you studied linguistics as a part of your course work in English? (Linguistics is the study of language, its structure and development.)" To this, 37 per cent of juniors and 33 per cent of seniors answered yes.

Asked to recall which of the listed linguistic terms were used in their study of linguistics, these students responded as shown below:

9. phonetics, 93%
8. word order, 86%; stress, 84%; generalization, 80%
7. pitch, 79%; inflections, 76%; classes of verbs, 71%
6. language families, 69%; semantics, 64%; levels of usage, 63%; structure words, 62%
5. disputed usage, 59%; structural meaning, 57%; intensifiers, 55%; cognates, 53%; derived sentences, Indo-European, and regionalism, all 50%
4. loaded words, 48%; noun cluster, 47%; function words, 42%
3. changing criteria of correctness, 39%; determiners, 37%; juncture, 32%
2. transforms, 28%; form classes, 24%; snarl/purr words, 23%; kernel sentences, 22%
1. phonemes, 18%; lexical meaning, 16%; allophones, 14%; test frames, 13%; Class I words, 12%; free morphemes and bound morphemes, each 8%; isogloss, 5%; suprasegmentals, 3%

Teachers who have conducted any classes that they called "linguistics," or are preparing to do so, can of course make their own analyses of these data. Others who may have greatly varying attitudes toward the term "linguistics" and its implications are naturally expected to disregard what follows, or to give it some attention, as they see fit. It is an attempt to make the data more meaningful by commenting upon why certain questions were asked.

The great majority of the terms are those used in structural linguistics. These were selected because at the time the survey was projected very little had been done to bring transformational grammar down to the level of school instruction. (I am told that times have changed since then.) With this fact in mind, the relative emphasis of aspects of structural linguistics taught in the schools can be determined by the reader without much trouble.

At the 2 level transforms and kernel sentences, and at the 5 level derived sentences were included in the list to get a fix upon the use of transformational grammar. I have been warned that responses to the last of these terms should be suspected as too high (50%) for the information furnished by the other two. Perhaps the "derivation" of sentences from ideas or by combining related ideas is a sufficiently common concept to have misled students who are not all transformationalists. That is, "derived sentences" sounds reasonable to almost any student of writing, and so, of the language.

Leading the list at 9, phonetics is also a very general term and does not give us, therefore, a great deal of special information. Word order at 8 is in the same category, and inflections at 7 is also suspect. At 8, 7, and 5, stress, pitch, and juncture are related structuralist terms, but the first two are also somewhat generalized. That is, students who really know the term juncture would link it to stress and pitch. The same is not true in reverse. Hence, the higher percentages for stress and pitch are probably spurious. (We all know that stress means "emphasis," and who has not heard that he has a voice of high or low pitch?)

The term semantics at 6 is probably high because the word is used in other English classes even though semantics may not be taught or discussed as a part of linguistics study. The rhetorician and semanticist will get more information, therefore, from the level of loaded words (at 4) and snarl/purr words (at 2).

The usage-oriented descriptive linguists will find levels of usage at 6, and disputed usage heading the 5's. Dialect study is represented by regionalism at 5 and isogloss at 1. The history of the language is supposedly represented by generalization at 8, language families at 6, and

cognates and Indo-European at 5. We trust that the latter three are giving proper information. But about the first we confess that we goofed: in manuscript it was generalization-specialization, but in print it suffered a truncation. As information, therefore, it must be thrown (or "trun") out.

Systematic Study of Linguistics

To wrap up the nature and extent of language study, the devisers of the questionnaire asked for estimates of the amount of study of "topics which are frequently dealt with in a systematic study of linguistics." The students were again asked to recall their work from grade 7 to the time of the response.

The results are as follows:*

Topics studied	Not at all	Less than one week	One to 3 weeks	More than 3 weeks
History of the English language	28/11	28/26	26/33	18/30
Propaganda and mass media	48/36	26/35	20/22	6/8
Usage problems	12/10	18/23	30/32	40/35
Linguistic geography	47/47	32/32	15/12	5/4
Transformations	57/55	23/31	14/10	6/4
Structural grammar	10/11	12/11	23/24	55/54
Dictionaries	10/14	39/37	28/32	19/22

Three final questions asked for only yes-no answers. Each specified "as part of your systematic study of linguistics" in an effort to preclude "halo" from general literary study or other English activities. The results follow:

". . . Did you read Middle English (Chaucer) in the original?"

Yes: juniors, 26%; seniors, 60%

". . . Did you read any Old English?"

Yes: juniors, 45%; seniors, 67%

". . . Did you use any programmed materials?"

Yes: juniors, 30%; seniors, 30%

*Responses are shown as percentages for the 11th/12th grades, respectively.

For the conclusion of this part of the report we have withheld a very early question, the one immediately following ". . . Have you studied linguistics . . . ?" to which 37% of seniors and 33% of juniors answered yes. The next question, addressed only to those who answered in the affirmative, as were all other language questions, was: "How was your course work in linguistics organized?" The responses:

	Per cent in grade eleven	Per cent in grade twelve
A. As a one-semester course	4	3
B. As a separate unit	17	18
C. Other than A or B, above. For example, you may have studied it on a one-day-a-week basis, or it may have been interspersed or integrated with other topics studied	79	79

Though the implications may seem obvious, we feel called upon (still as no more than a reporter) to suggest that these data are not very strong indicators of "the state of the art." They may mislead according to one's biases toward the art itself. As a comparison, consider the study of "traditional" grammar in grades 7 to 12. Is it really ever done by itself as a one semester course? How often is it done "as a separate unit," which may mean almost anything? For the five- or six-year span, perhaps the phrasing should have been "as a separate unit or as separate units."

The firm point to be made concerning this question is that the responses, upon reflection, show us that all other responses to language questions are very much affected by the time span (as much as five or six years) and the sporadic nature of the "systematic study" of linguistics. (It is about as systematic as what most English teachers lump together and call "grammar.") Before determining what is done in language study and deciding whether it is for good or ill, it might be a good idea for us teachers to try to recall things one has done over the years. How many movies in five years?—books read?—conferences with students?—hours of television per week, average?—concerts, plays, dances, rides on the freeway?—themes required?—themes returned?—snacks nibbled?—days of sunshine?

Students were asked to recall the total extent of pieces of fragmented study, by categories, over a period of years. It would be unwise to use these uncertain results in strong arguments for or against the linguistics program.

Literature

The Plan of the Survey

Although the survey of literature in the secondary school can hardly produce much new information, and none that is startling, it may be of much greater interest to the teacher than what has been reported concerning composition and language. Attitudes towards the teaching of literature differ greatly, of course. So do actual classroom practice and procedure. But literature differs from the other two aspects of English studies in that it has more focus. What is taught and how it is taught cannot differ greatly from class to class or school to school. These likenesses are created by the teachers' own educational experience and a strong tradition in school and college. That is, "everybody knows" what literary works must be read, what authors must be known about, if one is to qualify as an educated person.

What is found in the survey is, therefore, easily recognized as more or less standard—a kind of par for the course with which teachers can make comparisons of their own efforts, materials, and performance. The last of these, to be sure, is least susceptible to the judgment of comparison. For nothing has been asked, or could have been, that would establish a standard of quality in instruction or its effectiveness in student learning. Yet it is the most important factor of variability.

The information at hand can be organized into two main divisions, each with classes of subordinate detail. In the first division there are students' responses to questions concerning the nature of activities in literature classes and the relative importance of each activity. The second division reports what names of authors each student recognizes, and asks for a judgment separating those that are known from those that have been the object of some course activity, such as class discussion or the writing of a paper. This seems to be an attempt to find out which of the literary "greats" have survived changes in classroom atmosphere—if the atmosphere is really changing—and if they have survived, to wonder which authors are still lively, which obviously aging, and which moribund. (Galsworthy is an excellent example of the last, in my own experience.)

A few questions compare the reading of complete books with the reading of "excerpts from the works of" (the survey technique, generally). Other questions compare the scope of reading (or study) with the depth of interpretation attempted. Still others compare lively arts media with literature in its printed form.

Activities and Their Emphasis

Having specified that the list comprises activities which are often undertaken in connection with English classes, the devisers of the questionnaire present 28 questions concerned with what students do in classes devoted to the study of literature or of one of the handmaidens of the literary art, such as learning to read aloud and to listen. The responses are again, as they were for the composition questions, to be made by estimating whether the activity occurred frequently, occasionally, rarely, or never.

In reporting the results we shall use again the Index of Emphasis derived for the reporting of composition activities (see p. 7). Also, in the hope of making numbers more meaningful, the derivation of categories of activity is again attempted. The relative emphasis of activities within categories is shown by rank-ordering the answers and giving the IOE's upon which rank-order is based. The listing should be easy to follow. The column headings F, O, R, N stand for frequently, occasionally, rarely, and never (as before). Percentages of response for each are indicated for both the 11th and 12th grades, with a slash between. The n's mean "less than one per cent."

It should be added that basic frequency data are included for both grades because differences between grades are generally greater than the differences found in composition. For example, there are great enough differences in Categories III and VI to require a difference in rank-order for the 11's and the 12's, for three activities in each case. It is therefore interesting, and perhaps useful, to see the source of such differences as lying in frequently or occasionally or both.

For what it may be worth in considering the various emphases, a list of the categories is presented:

I. Literature assignments and outside reading

II. Listening skills, and note taking

III. Speaking and discussion, and notes

IV. Literary genre, sources, and excerpts

V. Reading and reporting

VI. Activities leading to understanding literature

TABLE 3

Summary of Activities in Literature Classes, Grades 11 and 12

Category	Rank	IOE* 11/12	F 11/12	O 11/12	R 11/12	N 11/12	What Students Did
I. Literature assignments and outside reading	1	115/114	85/84	12/13	2/n	n/n	Read literature assigned to the whole class
	2	111/104	80/73	18/23	2/3	n/n	Discussed literature assigned to the whole class
	3	57/55	27/25	46/46	21/21	6/8	Did "outside" reading for the class
II. Listening skills and note taking	1	79/80	49/50	33/32	14/13	4/5	Took notes on a lecture given by the teacher
	2	60/60	33/33	33/34	25/23	9/10	Listened without taking notes to a lecture given by the teacher
	3	41/43	14/19	46/35	22/23	18/22	Learned how to listen by listening to something read aloud by teacher
	4	19/17	3/2	24/22	33/36	40/39	Learned how to listen by listening to a recording
	5	7/9	1/2	6/6	21/26	71/66	Had your lecture notes checked by the teacher
III. Speaking and discussion, and notes	1	33/37	15/17	24/29	26/21	34/32	Learned how to read orally
	2	32/32	9/9	36/36	38/38	16/16	Gave an oral report
	3/5	29/12	7/2	30/14	52/27	11/57	Took notes on a panel discussion by others
	4/3	27/22	9/6	27/27	28/31	36/37	Took notes on an oral report given by another student
	5/4	22/20	6/4	23/23	33/33	38/40	Participated in a panel discussion

IV.	Literary genre, sources, and excerpts	1	85/79	55/50	29/31	10/10	6/9	Read literary selections from an anthology (containing a wide variety of materials such as poems, short stories, and essays)
		2	83/83	50/51	41/37	7/11	1/1	Read a poem
		3	80/72	46/41	45/40	8/15	1/4	Read a short story
		4	72/62	38/30	50/50	12/16	n/4	Read a novel
		5	55/53	24/24	49/43	23/26	4/7	Read an essay
		6	49/47	20/18	42/44	35/33	3/6	Read a play
		7	38/45	17/21	28/43	28/20	16/16	Read portions of a novel, poem, or play rather than the entire work
		8	35/32	11/10	36/32	40/41	12/17	Read a biography
V.	Reading and reporting	1	26/20	12/10	19/12	14/16	55/61	Made entries in a cumulative reading record
		2	21/22	5/6	21/22	37/31	38/41	Gave an oral book report
VI.	Activities leading to understanding literature	1	89/84	58/54	31/31	9/11	2/3	Discussed themes and purposes of literature
		2	73/79	43/47	41/40	14/10	2/3	Discussed the history of the time in or about which a book was written
		3/5	71/66	41/38	37/33	17/20	5/8	Analyzed the structure of a particular work (examined the ways in which the parts of a work contribute to the whole)
		4/3	70/75	39/46	42/33	15/14	4/6	Discussed the life of an author
		5/4	68/67	37/37	41/39	18/18	5/5	Discussed the relationship of ideas presented in a book to your own life and times

*Index of Emphasis (see text). Other column headings stand for Frequently, Occasionally, Rarely, and Never.

A Lookers' Guide

It is certainly not necessary to tell the interested teacher what he should do with what is presented, in "Look, Dick! Look, Jane!" fashion. But it may be helpful; for busy people skim along and sometimes hardly get their feet wet. To pull them down a bit, so that they may see quickly some of what lies beneath the surface, these comments:

Category I presents the predictable, mostly. To read and discuss literature at least once a week, on the average, is to do what everyone does. This reflects the usual concept of English as literature more than anything else. But what can be made of I 3, the outside reading bit? It is emphasized only half as much, on the average (say David and Janet), as reading that is required of the whole class. Is this a good thing because class reading and discussion are solid and time-consuming, requiring a great deal of time for preparation? Or should assigned reading for all students be sufficiently limited to permit individual development of reading taste? Would it work?

Category II may surprise some teachers and even whole departments. Its focus is upon the listening skill, with the concomitant of note taking. Both are much neglected—but are they "English"? And Category III goes on to speaking skills, with a different kind of notes—those attempting to record for later use the essence of presumably less-organized oral discourse than the teacher's, and of the predominantly nonorganized discourse of oral interchange.

Depending upon how lofty or how lowly the teacher's concept of his job is, he is likely to regard listening and speaking questions in this study as a waste of time or as of great moment. (I think they are the latter.) It is possible to think of English as telling the dummies what great writing is all about (an extreme, of course), or as moving the helpless creatures toward greater skill in reading, speaking, and listening, using good reading as basic material. (It strikes me that lofty objectives are limited to lofty subjects, who don't need much help anyway.) But there are limits. The use of verse that I admire to develop the halting reader's oral skills would be stupid on my part and devastating to the reader and all his fellow students. For average students, learning to read verse aloud passably well should make use of "The Listeners" or "The Death of the Hired Man" and not Shakespearean sonnets or Keats's "Ode on a Grecian Urn."

Category IV, literary genre, sources, and excerpts, is predictable on the whole when one considers the first-ranking response to the anthologies question. Poems and short stories are "high"; they don't require much space to print or, in many classes, much time to read and discuss.

They fit in very well, too, with a study of literature that has as one objective a smattering of the historical sweep of literature and the names of the greats. (These are not, I think, blameworthy objectives if kept in perspective—that is, as expected and useful, but subordinate.) That the novel comes next, seemingly more emphasized than essays, plays, and biographies, does not run counter to the point just made. One must bear in mind that work in class on a single novel will take so much time as to produce a heavy response of frequently or occasionally.

Category V, about reading records and oral book reports, probably merits the near-oblivion that students report.

As for Category VI, here is the real meat of the report if we could be sure of what is meant. One question of the five begins "Analyzed"; the others say "Discussed." Analyzed will do, if the teacher performs with remarkable perception and leadership. (Such performance is not easy.) Discussed tells us no more than that students recognized the intent of the several activities. Experience in observing class discussion tells us that the activity produces everything from mental exhilaration to shuddering awe, for class discussion of literature calls for inspired and unobtrusive direction, but gets it only infrequently.

<u>On Playing the Name-Game</u>

It may have been unintentional, or largely so, that the emphasis of the questions on composition and literature was put upon activities and their presumed outcomes rather than upon the mark of the educated man: the ability to look wise because of what he knows. It is the ability to look wise, smile knowingly, and interject a "Yes, but . . ." at carefully selected intervals, when the intelligentsia talk about:

Shakespeare, Donne, the Cavalier poets, Congreve and Wycherley, Mrs. Malaprop, who touches a hair of yon gray head, Houyhnhnms, O Rare Ben and Abou Ben . . .

Dolls' Houses and Cherry Orchards, Camus, Dostoevski (Oh to be in England!), Four Quartets, Genêt, Gide, Cowper, Crabbe . . .

And, toward the end of the alphabet, Odets, O'Neill, my name is Ozymandias, O wad some power the Giftie gi'e us, Orwell, the Rossettis, Rostand . . .

Sartre, Shaw, Smollett, and Swinburne; Tolkien, Tolstoi, Trollope, and both Wilde and Wilder, a couple of Williamses (Tenn and Wm Carlos), a Wolfe/Woolf or two too, and a Yeats. And a Thomas (Dylan), not a Dylan (Bob)—or possibly both.

This is the name game. A survey of literary acquaintanceship, being a cognitive rather

than an applicatory matter (know what versus know how) must play it. What difference it makes to be the proud owner of Knowledge Of The Literary Classics, except for a one-upmanship in parlor games, must be left to the people who make a business of literature vis-â-vis those who, most decidedly, do not. But in any case, a great many of us in the business will find the information on the authors that students say they know, or know and have studied, very interesting if not entirely edifying.

For instance, must a college-hopeful secondary school student "know" the fireside classics of the pioneer, self-educated: the Bible, Shakespeare, some Homer and Vergil, perhaps The Pilgrim's Progress or Robinson Crusoe? Does he also need, if he is to qualify, something of Ogden Nash, Pope, Mary McCarthy, Stevenson, Truman Capote, Malory, Fitzgerald (F. Scott), FitzGerald (the loaf, jug, and thou man), Lamb, Malraux, Faulkner, and Golding? . . . Bits of Chaucer, of Christopher Fry, Vachel Lindsay, and Harper Lee?

Let each one, then, be jury and judge according to his lights and laws. These are, as students report them, the facts. Some that may surprise us are presented first for their effect and value as shock or news. In the students' "modern world of today" they could be effectively presented in the popular Would you believe? style, like "Would you believe fifty per cent?—five?" Would You Believe . . . ?

—That ten per cent of secondary school students who intend to go to college have read no Shakespeare plays? Five per cent? Twenty-five per cent?

How many plays by Shakespeare have you read?

	Per cent, juniors	Per cent, seniors
None	22	21
One	45	40

—That half the students have read some parts of the Bible? That half of them have studied the Bible as literature?

Bible read outside	Per cent, juniors	Per cent, seniors
A. Old Testament or New Testament, or both, entire	14	10
B. At least one complete "book," e.g., the Psalms, Job	28	29
C. Some parts only, such as some psalms or parables	49	51
D. Not at all	9	9
Studied as literature		
One complete "book" (B, above)	17	17
Some parts only (C, above)	20	15
Several excerpts only	18	10
Nothing	45	58

—That the entire Aeneid, Iliad, or Odyssey has been studied in English class by as many as one-third of the students? No; only the last. The Odyssey, report 30% of juniors and 36% of seniors, was studied in its entirety. The Iliad, complete, was studied by 13% of juniors and 14% of seniors, and the complete Aeneid by 4% and 3%. Responses to "have you read [these classics]?" (not studied in class) indicate that about 24% of students have read parts of the Aeneid; 29% have read parts of the Iliad and 24% have read it all; 30% have read parts of the Odyssey and 44% have read it all. The overlap of "have read" and "have studied in English class" cannot be determined from the data. One assumes that it is considerable, since the questions do not call for independent reading responses—those not the result of course requirements.

The Great Authors List

The pièce de résistance of this literary fare is a list of the acquaintances and, we hope, some firm friends that students have made in the course of their English studies. The students responded to an alphabetical listing, Addison to Yeats, of the names of well-known authors, as the directions identified the list. Not all of them are, of course—or certainly not well known to 11th and 12th graders. And some well knowns, old timers and moderns, have been left out. Both Jonson and Johnson might have been included but were not, as well as Spenser, Gray, Carlyle, Ruskin, Macaulay, Hazlitt, and De Quincey. Dorothy Parker, Mary McCarthy, Erskine Caldwell, Carson McCullers, Truman Capote, and others are included, but GWTW's Margaret Mitchell is

not, nor Tarkington, Wister, Jack London, Johnny Tremaine's Forbes, nor even Ian Fleming. And of the poets, William Carlos Williams is asked about, but not Wallace Stevens.

However, the list is long and, technically, a sampling only, with almost all of the authors probably well known to students included. The lesser-known and many moderns, American, British, and Continental, reflect the individual interests, rather than any bias, of the committee responsible for creating the list. There are 171 items representing the work of 161 authors, with ten duplications because eight authors are well known for two kinds of literature, asked about separately, and the ninth, Goldsmith, for three (a very versatile writer, that one). The eight are T. S. Eliot, Emerson, Hardy, Kipling, Poe, Dylan Thomas, Scott, and Yeats. As every schoolboy knows, Emerson wrote verse as well as essays (well is ambiguous here), but Dylan Thomas as essayist may be a stranger to some of us.

The Highest Tenth

Of the 161 authors listed, sixteen have the distinction of having had some of their works studied by more than two-thirds of the seniors and fourteen of these by more than two-thirds of the juniors. The striking characteristic of the list is that it is so predominantly American. Only three British authors make the grade at the senior level, and two of these drop out of the 11th grade list. The three are Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Dickens. A further marvel is that the two dropouts do not include Dickens, who in fact heads the entire list as the author studied by more students than is any other.

Following Dickens come Frost, Twain, Poe, Hawthorne, and Longfellow. Shakespeare and Chaucer come next in rank for the "seniors" list; however, the works of Shakespeare producing the information are poems only. (His plays were asked about in a different way, with the results reported previously.) The second half of the list of sixteen authors is all American: Sandburg, Thoreau, Hemingway, O. Henry, Whitman, Irving, Melville, and Steinbeck.

The complete data follow. The rank-order is based upon 12th grade responses; percentages are given for responses to studied ("familiar with an author's work and discussed or wrote a paper about it in any English course . . . since the beginning of the ninth grade") and to read (familiar only). We cannot know how much, or what, has been studied or read, nor how much remains in the student's mind as more than a recognition of an author's name attached to something read away back in the ninth grade. On the other hand, this was not a test. It was a questionnaire to which the student responded when he wished, with whatever aid to recall he might manage to find,

including his teachers. There is, furthermore, clear evidence of accuracy, on the average, in the close agreement of percentages of responses by juniors and seniors, separately tabulated.

The table that follows indicates the percentage of eleventh grade and twelfth grade students who report that, since the ninth grade, they have studied or read works by the authors listed.

Author	Studied by Per cent of Juniors	Studied by Per cent of Seniors	Read by Per cent of Juniors	Read by Per cent of Seniors
Charles Dickens	85%	85%	13%	14%
Robert Frost	85	83	12	15
Mark Twain	82	83	14	15
Edgar Allen Poe, stories	81	82	16	16
Edgar Allen Poe, poems	80	80	15	16
Nathaniel Hawthorne	83	80	12	15
Henry Wadsworth Longfellow	79	78	15	17
William Shakespeare, poems	60*	78	21	13
Geoffrey Chaucer	33*	77	25	13
Carl Sandburg	74	74	18	20
Henry David Thoreau	72	73	12	14
Ernest Hemingway	73	72	22	24
O. Henry	71	72	21	21
Walt Whitman	72	70	15	21
Washington Irving	72	68	19	23
Herman Melville	67	67	17	19
John Steinbeck	72	67	20	25

Studied by 50% to 66% of Seniors

The next group begins just short of the two-thirds mark (for seniors) and ends at halfway. It numbers 27 authors, of whom 15 are British and 12 American. It will be noted again that major differences in percentages of juniors and seniors occur in the reports of British authors studied. We assume from this that the pattern of study which presents American literature as such in the eleventh grade and English literature in the twelfth is still followed in many schools.

There is nothing wrong with this procedure, I think. It is of interest because of its ancient tradition, probably preserved in some current secondary school English curriculum anthologies, four books for four years. The anthologies, if this is so, are perpetuating an arrangement that

*Less than two-thirds of 11th graders. See text.

has now endured for two-thirds of a century. One wonders how many teachers and publishers know how it all started. Or why Silas Marner and A Tale of Two Cities are, shall we say, ubiquitous in today's schools.

	Studied by Per cent of Juniors	Seniors		Studied by Per cent of Juniors	Seniors
Wordsworth (b)	39%	66%	Eliot, George (d)	60%	56%
Dickinson	74	65	Franklin	60	56
Stevenson (a)	54	65	Millay	55	56
Emerson, essays	66	64	Byron (b)	37	54
Milton (c)	26	64	Kipling, poetry (a)	43	54
Tennyson (b)	45	64	Pope (c)	21	54
Benét	61	63	Shelley (c)	26	54
Browning (b)	43	63	Bryant	54	53
Emerson, poems	60	61	Conrad (b)	32	53
Keats (c)	34	61	Cooper	51	53
Crane	66	58	Lewis	52	52
Whittier	58	58	Shaw (b)	35	51
Swift (c)	27	57	Harte	53	50
Coleridge (b)	37	56	Thurber	53	50

The Not-Too-Well-Knowns

Something of Faulkner's and Wilder's has been studied, students tell us, by 48% of the seniors and, respectively, 53% and 54% of the juniors. The works of T. S. Eliot (poems), Kipling (prose), Marlowe, Defoe, Addison, Lamb, and Donne, the novels of Hardy and poetry of Scott all range downward from 46% to 41%, with much lower percentages for juniors in most cases. Cummings and Orwell find their way into the company of these established "greats," and Cummings, as might be expected, is the only one whose work has been studied by more juniors than seniors.

The range of differences between juniors and seniors may be of some interest, raising questions about some British works introduced, perhaps by the anthologies, before the English-literature-for-twelfth-graders course. The percentages of juniors and seniors are presented in that order for each

---

(a) Slight increase in 12th grade.
(b) Considerable increase in 12th grade.
(c) Great increase in 12th grade.
(d) No increase in 12th grade. (Silas Marner is "done" in 10th, usually. (See text.)

author: T. S. Eliot, 33/46; Kipling, 37/46; Marlowe, 19/46; Defoe, 19/44; Addison, 14/43; Lamb, 20/42; Donne, 20/41; Hardy, 21/41; Scott, 25/41.

A still longer list carries us down to the lower limit of the not-too-well-knowns. Since they are all known to us, however, we may have an interest in their fortunes. Works of the following authors have been the subject of study by the indicated percentages of twelfth graders at some time since they began the ninth grade: Ogden Nash, 40%; Boswell, 39%; Blake, Emily Brontë, and O'Neill, each 38%; Scott, stories, 36%; Austen, de Maupassant, and Salinger, each 35%; Bunyan, Goldsmith (verse), and Sophocles, each 34%; Charlotte Brontë, Lindsay, and Malory, each 33%; Fitzgerald, Hugo, and Thackeray, each 32%; Yeats, verse, 31%; and Cather, Dante, and Conan Doyle, each 30%. The last three find themselves in strange company, testimony to the catholic tastes of English teachers, no doubt.

Major differences in percentages of juniors reporting that they have studied the works of these authors are as follows: Boswell, 13%; Blake, 17%; Emily Brontë, 28%; Bunyan, 11%; Goldsmith and Sophocles, each 16%; Lindsay (up) at 39%; Malory, 9%; Thackeray, 16%, Yeats, 18%; Cather (up) at 38%; and Dante, 18%.

What Ever Happened to . . . ?

Prior mention has been made of fewer than half the old friends and new acquaintances of the committee that created the list. Almost ninety names remain. Except for some feeling of need to complete the record, there is not much warrant for listing the have-beens or never-weres except to satisfy the natural professional curiosity of the teacher of literature. What ever happened to Edgar Lee Masters, Edith Wharton, John Galsworthy—to Ezra Pound, Elmer Rice, and Edwin Arlington Robinson? What about Ogden Nash and Dorothy Parker—Richard Brinsley Sheridan and Robert Sherwood?—Aldous Huxley, Marianne Moore, John Hersey, and Thomas Mann?

Very briefly, this is how they have fared in today's secondary schools. They are listed in three groups, in descending order of study by seniors.

Studied by 29% down to 20%

Huxley	Williams, Tennessee	Hardy (poems)	Wharton
Masters	James	Lee, Harper	Goldsmith (plays)
Golding	Eliot, T. S. (plays)	Thomas (poems)	Hersey
Wilde	Ibsen	White, E. B.	Mann
Chekhov	Joyce	Cervantes	Tolstoi
Miller	Voltaire	Dostoevski	
Robinson	Galsworthy	Fielding	

Studied by 19% down to 10%

Dumas	Baldwin, James	Forster	Camus
Hyerdahl	Goldsmith (novels)	Greene	Paton
Euripides	Auden	Lawrence	Thomas (essays)
Lardner	Woolf	Sartre	O'Casey
Molière	Aeschylus	Sheridan	Yeats (plays)

Studied by fewer than 10%

Beckett	Synge	Dos Passos	Kazantzakis
Parker	Aiken	Genêt	Mailer
Pound	Flaubert	Ionesco	Malamud
Sherwood	Marvell	McCarthy	Moore, Marianne
Updike	Sterne	McCullers	Nabokov
Anderson, S.	Albee	Odets	Rice
Warren	Anderson, M.	Trollope	Roth
Caldwell	Williams, Wm. C.	Gide	Stendahl
Fry	Anouilh	Inge	Tolkien
Kafka	Bellow	Harris, Mark	
Rostand	Capote	Jones, James	

Appendix
Description of Design and Administration of Survey

Sampling Plan

The sampling frame for this survey included all students who had taken College Board achievement tests in December 1965, January 1966, and March 1966 and juniors who had taken these tests in May 1966. However, college and postgraduate students, and students attending secondary schools located in areas other than the 50 states, were excluded.

Samples of equal size were drawn for all tests within an administration. The sampling procedure based the selection of students on the last three digits of the student registration number, the assumption being that these digits are randomly distributed. However, because no student was to be included in more than one sample within an administration, the selection method was not strictly random. The few students who happened to be drawn for two samples were excluded from the sample for the more popular test.

Nine hundred and seventy-five cases were selected in each subject from each of three administrations (December, January, and May) and 675 cases from the March administration. Since duplication could occur across administrations, the students were requested to complete only the first questionnaire received. The total n was approximately 38,000 students from 50 states and 7,555 secondary schools. The sample size for each subject is given in the first column of the Response Summary. Whenever the data from samples from several administrations or samples from different tests within an administration were combined for presentation in one of these reports, the responses were weighted in proportion to the total population that they represented.

Description of the Questionnaires

Each of the ten questionnaires used in this survey had three parts. Part I described general course work in grades 9 through 12 in seven general areas: English, mathematics, history and social studies (including social sciences), foreign languages (modern and classical), science, art and music, and practical arts. Part II provided detailed information on the specific courses taken by the student in one of five general areas (area dependent on the test for which the student was selected). Part III focused primarily on either course content or methodology in the subject in which the student took a College Board achievement test.

Testing specialists from Educational Testing Service, working with committees of examiners in each subject, formulated the questionnaires and assisted in planning the analysis. The following kinds of questions were included in Part III.

1. Questions that sought to determine the extent to which new topics or emphases were being introduced or old topics and emphases were being dropped.
2. Questions designed to identify subgroups of students whose preparation deviated systematically from all other subgroups or from the general group.

3. Questions that would yield evidence of the variability in breadth and depth of subject-matter coverage.
4. Questions that would reveal variability in elements or aspects of the curriculum not necessarily related to secondary school curriculum-reform movements. These included questions based on presumably stable portions of the curriculum which would not only serve as additional evidence of construct validity but would also provide a means for tracing curricular change in the future.
5. Questions that would provide a check on the reliability and validity of candidates' responses. These included somewhat differently worded questions bearing on the same topic as well as questions geared to different levels of specificity or generality.

The instructions for answering the questions in Part III were generally related to when students took specific tests. In most cases, if they took the test in December or January, they were to report on what they had studied in that subject through the fall (or first semester) of the 1965-66 academic year; if they took the test in March, they were to report on what they had studied up to the time they took the test; if they took the test in May, they were to report on what they had studied as of the end of the 1965-66 academic year, which, in this case, was the end of the junior year. However, for languages, because the emphasis was on methodology rather than content, students reported only for the grades in secondary school in which they had studied the language for at least one semester.

Administration of the Questionnaires

Each questionnaire was accompanied by a general letter of invitation which emphasized the desirability of accurate information and urged students to seek their teachers' assistance, whenever necessary. The mailing addresses were those provided by the students on their registration forms. In most cases, these were the students' home addresses. A code number consisting of six digits was preprinted on each Part I answer sheet. The first digit identified questionnaire part (Part I, II, or III), the second digit identified subject, and the last four digits identified the student.

Access to a special tape was a convenient means of obtaining information, such as test scores (including scores on all achievement tests and on the Scholastic Aptitude Test), secondary school, and, in some instances, background information on candidate preparation in the subject in which he took the test. It also provided a system for informing principals as to which students in their schools received questionnaires and which students had not returned completed forms.

Response to Survey

The excellent cooperation of both students and principals resulted in returns from three-fourths of the candidates contacted. However, about 5 per cent of the returns, for one reason or another, were not usable. As noted on the following page, these responses vary—from a low of 60 per cent for those who took the American History and European History tests to a high of 75 per cent for those who took the French and Physics tests.

In addition, many letters were received from students, teachers, and administrators indicating their appreciation of the fact that the College Entrance Examination Board wanted to prepare tests that reflected the secondary school preparation of the students who took them. Thus, students would be assured an equal opportunity to show on the tests what they had learned even though their secondary school programs were different.

Response Summary

Test	Number contacted	Number of usable returns	Per cent response
English	3,474	2,313	67%
American History European History	5,137	3,079	60
French	3,486	2,600	75
German	3,487	2,579	74
Spanish	3,452	2,447	71
Latin	3,540	2,595	73
Mathematics Level I Mathematics Level II	5,448	3,769	69
Biology	3,379	2,275	67
Chemistry	3,338	2,458	74
Physics	3,373	2,513	75
Totals	38,114	26,628	70%

Additional Comments

It is important to note that the students submitting data for these reports represent an atypical group of prospective college students. Compared with a national sample of college entrants, in College Board Score Reports, . . . 1968-69, p. 25, they rank close to the 75th percentile on the Scholastic Aptitude Test in both Verbal and Mathematical scores.

It is not too surprising to find that this is an extremely able group because, other things being equal, colleges that use achievement tests put emphasis on the ability and preparation of their students. For example, it is interesting to note that of the 177 colleges and universities described by Cass and Birnbaum, Comparative Guide to American Colleges, as most selective, highly selective, or very selective, 130 of them required College Board achievement tests for admission in September 1966.